The lowest chronological age was 22, the highest 30, with a median of 24. The distribution of states from which they came into the army was: Oklahoma, 4; North Carolina, 4, Kentucky, 2; Texas, 2; Mississippi, 1; Georgia, 1; District of Columbia, 1. They reported the following school attendance:

No schooling	4
One year schooling	2
Two years schooling	1
Three years schooling	1
Four years schooling	3
Five years schooling	2
Seven years schooling	1
Eight years schooling	1

The median is 3 years of school attendance. Of these fifteen men, 4 were common laborers, 10 farmers, and 1 an actor. The weekly wages as given by the men were, before they entered the army, for nine of them from $4.00 to $55.00 per week. The one getting $55.00 was an actor. The average for the nine was $28.75. Six stated that they merely received the crop and could not estimate their income. Six reported that they were unmarried, eight that they were married and one was not sure whether he was or not. Ten reported that they had no children, four that they one child and one that he had two children. The following venerial report was given:

Non-venerial	7
Gonorrhea	6
Syphilis	1
Syphilis and Gonorrhea	1

The Stanford-Binet test was given to get the mental age. This ranged from 8 years 6 months to 12 years 8 months, with a median of .10 years 2 months. Of the fifteen, twelve had a mental age of less than 12 years.

Of these men twelve rated as morons and the other three were borderline cases. It would be interesting to know if a large majority of the men court-martialed in the army were not feeble-minded or borderline cases. All of the above would rate as such. At the same time they were considered mentally responsible for their acts. It would also be of interest to find out the relation between schooling and the accusation of crime. It was evident from the examination of these men that each had lived in an environment which corresponded to his natural mental endowments.—C. E. Benson, Professor of Psychology, State Teacher's College, Cape Girardeau, Mo.

Courts—Laws

Probation System in U. S. Courts.—The following bill for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia (H. R. 12036) was introduced in the House of Representatives, Sixty-sixth Congress, Second Session, on January 24, 1920, by Mr. Augustine Lonergan, H. R., First District Conn.:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the judge or judges of any United States court having original jurisdiction of criminal actions, except in the District of Columbia, may appoint one or more persons to serve as probation officers within the jurisdiction and under the direction of the judge or

judges making such appointment or their successors. Such judge or judges may, in their discretion, remove any probation officer serving in such court.

The appointment of each probation officer shall be in writing and shall be entered on the records of the court of the judge or judges making such appointment, and copies of the order of appointment shall be delivered to the officer so appointed and filed in the office of the Attorney General. Each probation officer before entering upon the duties of his office shall take an oath of office, to be administered by a judge of such court. Each probation officer, in the discretion of the judge or judges making the appointment or their successors, may be required to furnish a bond in such sum and with such securities as such judge or judges shall direct. Such oath of office and such bond shall be filed with the clerk of the court in which such officer is serving.

Such judge or judges shall determine whether any probation officer shall receive a salary, and if so, shall fix the amount thereof, subject in each case to the approval of the Attorney General: *Provided,* That probation officers who are to receive salaries shall be appointed after competitive examination held in accordance with the laws and regulations of the civil service of the United States. Such judge or judges may allow any probation officer his actual expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of his duties. Such salary and expenses when so determined and approved shall be paid from the appropriations for the contingent expenses of the court or courts in which such officer serves.

Sec. 2. That after a plea or verdict of guilty or a plea of nolo contendere in a prosecution for any crime or offense, except those punishable by death or life imprisonment, in any United States court having original jurisdiction of criminal actions, except in the District of Columbia, the court may suspend sentence and may also place the defendant on probation under the supervision of a probation officer for such period and under such conditions of probation as the court shall determine, or the court may impose a fine and may also place the defendant on probation in the manner aforesaid. The court may revoke or modify any condition of probation, or may change the period of probation: *Provided,* That the original period of probation, together with any extension thereof, shall not exceed five years.

While on probation the defendant may be required to pay in one or several sums a fine imposed at the time of being placed on probation and may also be required to make restitution or reparation to the aggrieved party or parties for actual damages or loss caused by the offense for which conviction was had, and may also be required to provide for the support of any person or persons for whose support he is legally responsible.

The court may revoke the suspension of sentence or the probation, and cause the defendant to be arrested and brought before the court at any time within the probation period, or at any time after the probation period, but within the maximum period for which the defendant might originally have been sentenced. Thereupon the court may impose any sentence which might originally have been imposed.

Sec. 3. That it shall be the duty of a probation officer to investigate any case referred to him for investigation by the court in which he is serving and to report thereon to the court. The probation officer shall furnish to each peson released on probation under his supervision a written statement of the

conditions of probation and shall instruct him regarding the same. Such officer shall keep informed concerning the conduct and condition of each person on probation under his supervision and shall report thereon at least monthly to the court placing such person on probation. Such officer shall use all suitable methods, not inconsistent with the conditions imposed by the court, to aid persons on probation and to bring about improvement in their conduct and condition. Such officer shall keep records of his work; shall keep accurate and complete accounts of all moneys collected from persons under his supervision, shall give receipts therefor, and shall make at least monthly returns thereof; shall make such reports to the Attorney General as he may at any time require; and shall perform such other duties as the court may direct. A probation officer shall have such power of arrest as is now exercised by a deputy marshal.

Sec. 4. That this Act shall take effect immediately.

PENOLOGY

Women Offenders and Offenses in Chicago.—Fifty per cent of the women whose cases form the basis of the report of social service work in the Women's Department, Chicago House of Correction, September 1, 1917, to March 1, 1919, were committed to the House of Correction under the Disorderly Conduct Ordinance, known at 2012. While a 2012 charge may represent, and is generally looked upon as a "petty offense," due to the elasticity of the ordinance, it may be made to embrace anything from the smallest misdemeanor up to a penitentiary offense, and the punishment may be a $5.00 fine, or it may be $206.50. The total number of women included in the study is 130.

In studying the 2012 offenders, we find that the group is made up of almost an equal number of young first commitments and old offenders—the types that present the most hopeful and the least hopeful possibilities, and the very ones that should not be found in the House of Correction at all.

The old alcoholics and drug addicts, coming each time before a different judge, are repeatedly sent to the House of Correction on a 2012 charge with a fine of $5.00 and $10.00 costs, when, if given the maximum sentence, they would at least be given the best opportunity that exists under present legal provision to be kept a longer time, and to get the poisons out of their systems and build up their physical strength.

The young first commitments sent to the House of Correction on a 2012 charge are classed with the old offenders, when an investigation preceding trial would have resulted, in many cases, in probation or release.

Great care and caution is used by the court in the treatment of the girl up to eighteen years, but as soon as she gets beyond this age she is open to the same treatment as the old offender, unless some one is present to urge probation or unless the judge suggests investigation and probation, neither of which is the case in many instances. Why should not the juvenile-adult girl offender be recognized and given the same consideration as the juvenile-adult boy offender?

That certain conditions prevail is not entirely the fault of the judge sentencing the women. First, there is an absence of proper institutions for their care. Second, the frequent shifting of judges from one court to another gives no one judge an opportunity of recognizing repeaters, or opportunity